LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1500
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Why I Am An Agnostic

INCLUDING EXPRESSIONS OF FAITH FROM A PROTESTANT, A CATHOLIC AND A JEW

Clarence Darrow

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1500
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Why I Am An Agnostic

INCLUDING EXPRESSIONS OF FAITH FROM A PROTESTANT, A CATHOLIC AND A JEW

Clarence Darrow

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

Page

An Experiment in Fraternity..... 5
George G. Whitehead.

Why I Am a Protestant.....10
Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes.

Why I Am An Agnostic.....27
Clarence Darrow.

Why I Am a Catholic.....41
Judge John P. McGoorty.

Why I Am a Jew.....52
Rabbi Jacob Tarshish.

The Aftermath 61

WHY I AM AN AGNOSTIC

Clarence Darrow

INCLUDING EXPRESSIONS OF FAITH FROM A PROTESTANT, A CATHOLIC AND A JEW

AN EXPERIMENT IN FRATERNITY

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, Protestant
Clarence S. Darrow, Agnostic
Judge John P. McGoorty, Catholic
Rabbi Jacob Tarshish, Jew

By George G. Whitehead

It was my privilege to direct a religious forum in Memorial Hall, Columbus, Ohio, March 12, 1929. Outstanding representatives of three great faiths, with America's foremost Agnostic completing the quartet, were presented under the same roof and from the same platform. Each speaker gave in 30 minutes the reason for his belief, or lack of it.

Dr. William Oxley Thompson, president emeritus of Ohio State University, was chairman of the meeting. The official attendance

was 4,257, in an auditorium with a natural capacity of 3,661. All permissible stage seating and standing room were utilized, and many were turned away. It was one of the largest and most representative groups ever assembled in historic Memorial Hall. Patrons came from a radius of 100 miles.

The crowd, which never wavered in its attention, represented a fair cross-section of middle-state people—the sort of cross-section found in street car, department store, theater or office building. There were Protestants, Catholics, Jews and Agnostics, and all gave their undivided attention to each speaker in his turn: They applauded the evident sincerity of Bishop Hughes. They laughed spontaneously at Mr. Darrow's characteristic onslaughts. They rose willingly to a comprehension of the faith of Judge McGoorty. And if they applauded longer and louder for Rabbi Tarshish, it probably was an evidence of well-placed local pride.

The order of the speakers was determined by lot, immediately preceding the forum, and the addresses, stressing Protestant prosperity, Agnostic doubt, Catholic infallibility and Jewish pride, were delivered in the routine here published.

WHO'S WHO OF FORUM SPEAKERS

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, champion of Protestantism, is a native of Moundsville, W. Va. He holds degrees from West Virginia University, Iowa College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Boston University, Syracuse University, DePauw University and the University of Maine. After being ordained in the Methodist Episcopal ministry in 1892, he became a pastor at Newton Center, Mass., and from there went to Malden, Mass. He was president of DePauw University from 1903 to 1908, and went from that position to the Methodist bishopric. He is author of "Thanksgiving Sermons," "The Teaching of Citizenship," "A Boy's Religion," "The Bible and Life," "God's Family" and other religious books.

Clarence S. Darrow, whose name immediately brings up recollections of Loeb and Leopold, the McNamara Brothers, John Thomas Scopes and others who have been defended by his legal genius, told his Columbus audience why he is an Agnostic. Originally Mr. Darrow came from Trumbull County, Ohio, where he was born in 1857. He studied law in the office of a justice of the peace, and was admitted to

the bar shortly after he became of age. After serving one corporation, the Northwestern Railway, he changed the type of his practice, and since that time has represented some of the most notable defendants in all legal history. In fact, the participation of Mr. Darrow has made his cases internationally significant. The only public office he has ever held was as a member of the Illinois legislature. In recent years Mr. Darrow has devoted less time to the practice of law, and more time to writing and public speaking, both of which he thoroughly enjoys.

JUDGE JOHN P. MCGOORTY, the Catholic speaker, is—like Mr. Darrow—a native of northeastern Ohio who has achieved considerable fame in the legal profession. He was born in Conneaut, Ohio, and was reared in Wisconsin. After graduating at the Chicago Law College in 1892, he practiced his profession in Chicago. In 1896 he was elected to the Illinois legislature, and was re-elected in 1898, 1904 and 1906. Since 1911 he has served with distinction on the Chicago bench. He was elected circuit court judge in 1911, and re-elected four years later. He was chief justice of the circuit court. He became judge of the appellate court of the first district of Illinois

for a term of three years, from 1915 to 1918. Since that time he has been on the Superior Court bench in Chicago.

Representing the Jewish faith at the Columbus forum was RABBI JACOB TARSHISH, a native of Baltimore and the son of a Hebrew professor. He received an A. B. degree from the University of Cincinnati in 1914, and a Rabbinical degree from Hebrew Union College in 1915. He received an M. A. degree from Lehigh University, and studied for his Doctor of Philosophy degree at Columbia University and Ohio State University. He went to Columbus, Ohio, in 1922, after serving at Allentown, Pa., and Yonkers, N. Y. He conducts radio services at Temple Israel, Columbus, each Sunday morning, through Station WAIU. He is actively identified with the Chamber of Commerce, the Library Board and many other civic organizations in Columbus, and has spoken before practically every type of audience in his home city.

WHY I AM A PROTESTANT

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes,
Methodist Episcopal Church

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are not here tonight for the purpose of seeing which horse may come first under the wire. We should rid our minds of the race-track idea and should keep the thought that we are to confer about several possible roads of life. This is not a debate; it is a conference. We are not to answer each other, but to tell each other. Consequently, my own part in the program has been strictly prepared, and I trust that the manuscript would show that I have not had the spirit of the demagogue seeking to win applause by plain ridicule or doubtful humor, but rather the mood of a man who has a strong conviction and who is ready to give a positive and constructive witness for the faith that is in him.

I need not halt to say that the significance of the word "Protestant" is far broader than its etymological meaning. A Protestant is not one who merely protests any more than a Catholic is one who merely universalizes. A Methodist is quite more than one who methodizes;

a Presbyterian quite more than a Presbyter, an older man; and an American quite more than a political descendant of Amerigo Vespucius! We are not here to discuss verbalisms. Perhaps it is a limitation that two of us, standing tonight for the Christian faith, are put in a position where our final word must be a statement of two differing schemes of the working out of that faith. But this can be done with courtesy. I do not hesitate to say that my Catholic friend, his high character and his fine service as a citizen, gives me the confident conviction that, if I am faithful, I shall meet him finally in the forum of infinite truth where all our differences shall be harmonized in the love of Christ.

It would doubtless not be sportsmanlike for three champions of theism to combine in an overdone attack upon a lonely Agnostic, even though the Agnostic may feel that the unexplained riddle of his own powers may enable him to take good care of himself! Admitting all the mysteries of the theistic position, I may say that our opposing friends do not get rid of those mysteries. When Spencer in his "First Principles" states the difficulties, and, as he would claim, the possibilities, involved in the questions of eternity and of power, he states

two alternatives, one of which must be true. Either matter is eternal or God is eternal; or both are co-eternal. No man escapes the problem. The great thinker said that nothing is more certain than that "we are ever in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed." However one may define that energy—mechanism, vitalism, holism, or God—the mystery abides. When a man dismisses a conscious and intelligent person from the throne of the universe and brings in an unconscious and mechanical force, he does not rid himself of the mystery. Rather does he increase that mystery. He puts aside vast evidences of purpose and devotes himself to the consideration of occasional freakishness. It is just as reasonable to say that a book with its ordered pages and paragraphs came without the plans of writer and typesetter and binder as to say that this body with its millions and millions of cooperating cells came from an unthinking World Ground. This, to one who holds the primary faith of Jew or Catholic, or Protestant, is the final unreason. We believe, therefore, that Agnosticism is the evasion of the supreme question of life, and that it fails in that glorious adventure wherein

the intellect of man is joined by his sensibilities in the demand for the living God.

I am likewise sure that the two of us who stand for the Christian faith recognize our common heritage from the faith of the Jews. We rejoice in the fact that Abraham towers in the field of history and of thought. In the necessity of the case there must have been a man who broke away from the superstitions of polytheism and so found his way into the rapture of the One God as to go out on holy errands for his faith. We rejoice that Jews, Mohammedans and Christians all unite in confessed obligation to Abraham, the Father of their spiritual multitudes. Beyond this, we are glad that the Old Testament and the New Testament are bound together in our Christian Bible. But we do believe that our faith makes clearer the prophetical promises of redemption; that it brings God closer to the common experience of life; and that Jesus really added vast things when He kept saying—"Ye have heard that it hath been said by those of olden time; * * * but I say unto you."

More general appraisals of the Jewish faith are not easy. It presents an altogether peculiar relation of race and religion, so that it is often difficult to tell where one ends and the other

begins. Also, it has not had in the modern era much separate and corporate expression of its own influence and life, inasmuch as its people have not usually been the majority in any nation and so have had their achievements mingled with those of other races and faiths. But let it be freely and gladly allowed that under the power of its thought of God it has made genuine contributions to education and finance and character; that it has maintained generous philanthropies, especially among its own people; and that we confess with it a genuine spiritual kinship.

Then we can fairly add that Christ put into his followers an amazing dynamic and a promise of personal power and presence that quickly sent St. Paul upon heroic journeys and has continued through the years to send believers out to farthest frontiers of need where walls of superstition were heaviest and darkest. The faith of Christ has literally started many armies of men and women out to ford the last river, to climb the last mountain, to cross the last sea, and to find the last man in order that in a deep way it might make Jerusalem the joy of the whole earth and bring in the day foretold by Jewish prophets, when the knowledge of the Great God should cover that

earth as the waters cover the sea. Believing that the Christian faith gathers into itself the glory of the Hebrew revelation and fills it with new grace and new power that it may go out to take the world for a redeeming God, we gladly accept Christ's invitation to come from the East and the West and the North and the South and to sit down in the kingdom of heaven with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Let me continue with the apparently superficial statement that I am a Protestant because I was so born and so reared; and let me frankly admit that this lonely statement could be readily attacked. It needs some supplements. Many thousands of men have crossed the lines of their religious nativity. Romanes went from Christianity to Agnosticism and, finding only barrenness there, swung back again to a vigorous and vital Christian belief. St. Paul, like many thousands of persons who were born Jews, passed over into the ardor of the Christian faith—while Judaism has often had an open gate through which, first and last, proselytes have entered. Martin Luther, with many others, passed from Catholicism to Protestantism. Cardinal Newman, with many others, passed from Protestantism to Catholicism. From each of the standpoints

represented in this discussion men have changed to each of the other standpoints. Evidently, therefore, there are often considerations stronger than the prepossessions of nativity; and every thoughtful man will insist that his faith shall have a firmer foundation than a rocking cradle! None the less, the domestic heritage is not one to be tossed aside lightly. Our fathers and mothers are within proper limits evidences of a faith. Often they hold us, not so much by formal arguments, as by the living credentials of their own hearts and lives. We saw so much of their integrity, love, devotion, sacrifice, that they became to us at least minor proofs and major prophets of their religion. We passed from their immediate influence, not to forsake them in a bumptious independence, but rather to discover whether the wider world would add to the arguments for their faith.

Beyond this, the domestic heritage has a peculiar meaning for a Protestant. Without my choice, I was born outside the Catholic faith. All my forbears, reaching back into the third previous century, have held the evangelical faith. It follows, of course, that my only way into the Catholic fold could be chosen by my private judgment. Since I was born and

reared outside a recognized religious authority, you must convince me that such an authority exists. You cannot ask me to accept authority on the basis of its authority! You must assure my personal judgment that official infallibility in faith and morals exists, ere you ask me to confess that infallibility. There is absolutely no other road for me from Protestantism to Catholicism than the road of my private judgment. But if my private judgment must have a primacy in determining the total scheme of religion to which I submit myself, why is it afterward to be denied its legitimacy in the higher ranges of faith and morals? It seems like a strange and contradictory thing to try to convince a man's private judgment that henceforth, in the most important and sweeping decisions of life, it is to have no judgment. It is like telling reason that it has a right to reason reason out of reason; or telling judgment to determine by judgment that it must surrender judgment!

You will thus see, ladies and gentlemen, that the statement that a man is a Protestant because he was born one, needs some important supplements, and involves for him a personal primacy of judgment stoutly denied by a religion of authority.

(2) To pass to the wider considerations, the Protestant firmly believes that he finds the evidences for his faith in the larger outcomes of life beyond the home. In some of these investigations he finds himself in company with his Catholic brother. We stand together in a thousand charities. Atheism, materialism, agnosticism are not great builders of Old People's Homes, or Orphanages, or Hospitals. Brotherhood without fatherhood seems to be both difficult and inefficient. But the two forms of Christianity have joined the Carpenter of Nazareth in erecting places of gentle mercy and have scattered over the wide earth the institutional evidences that the heart of their religion is love.

Thus we walk in company along many beautiful ways. But directly we come to some tragic separations. Certain edicts make it impossible for us to worship together; and these same edicts provide that when we go down into our graves the fence of division shall still be builded. I am a Protestant partly because those edicts have not been issued from our headquarters; partly because I may freely go to any Catholic places of worship without ecclesiastical hindrance; partly because there is nothing in my creed or in my religious com-

munion that keeps me from recognizing the true Church of Christ wherever good and pious souls gather in the Holy Name. I am a Protestant partly because I do sing freely in our own services Newman's "Lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom," and Faber's "Faith of our fathers, living still," and appropriate for my soul's good many other touches of Catholic song and devotion. I still entertain the hope that some day the hearts of our Catholic comrades may often express themselves in Charles Wesley's "Jesus Lover of My Soul," or in that lyric of Christian challenge produced by Dr. Gladden, a Columbus pastor, "O, Master, let me walk with Thee, in lowly paths of service free."

In other and shorter words, I am a Protestant because as a Protestant I can be more really Catholic.

I am a Protestant, also, because my study of four centuries of history convinces me that my faith has an efficient relation to popular prosperity. There are countries that are overwhelmingly Protestant, and other countries that are overwhelmingly Catholic; and these may be compared and contrasted. In doing this, we may carry the emphasis too far. Perhaps in recent years there has been a tendency

in some quarters to make the Christian Temple an annex to the Market, and to judge of its worth too much in economic terms. Material values are not the premier effects of Christianity; but in a familiar word Jesus classed them as important by-products—"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Again we need to avoid what the logicians call "the fallacy of the universal." In both the religious camps we could find individuals of large wealth; in both camps we could doubtless find some whose wealth did not stand wholly for fine character—whether in the manner of getting or in the mood of giving. We avoid the possible fallacy by using the broader method. Take the economic tables of the nations and lay them side by side—the Catholic in one group, the Protestant in the other. Strike your aggregates and likewise your results. After allowing all of the factors that enter into the problem, such as the destructions of war and the natural lack of large economic possibilities, the balances are surely on the Protestant side of the ledger.

May I not say, as well, that this feature of the case has a marked application to the United States. Here, from the beginning of our coun-

try's great growth, there has been a decided preponderance of Protestants. Even now, on the best figures obtainable, our Catholic friends make not over one-sixth of our population. The other five-sixths are not all even formally Protestant; but the vast majority of them are such. Our national leadership has been largely of that faith. When Cardinals from foreign countries came to the Eucharistic Congress, they did not hesitate to laud our land for its wonderful achievements. We are today the richest nation on earth; and perhaps the richest nation that God has ever had in the world's history. The predominant religious faith of our people has not worked toward economic destruction, or even to economic mediocrity. It would be unfair for us to claim all the credit for the mighty achievements in subduing a wild continent and in producing at last an economic system characterized more and more by ethical justice and democratic opportunity; but we can certainly claim that in a predominantly Protestant land the tables of individual and corporate prosperity are not without their lesson. Nor can it be said that we have been mainly worshippers of the Golden Calf. The United States has never had a permanent commercial hero. All the millionaires

of this day stand, in the estimate of the people, on levels far below Abraham Lincoln.

I am a Protestant because all my study of individual and national life convinces me that the free evangelical faith is the producer of democratic education. Being willing to admit cheerfully that in the Dark Ages the lights of learning were kept burning in the Monasteries and that through the modern period Catholicism, both Greek and Roman, has sedulously educated its leaders, I must still claim that in all their lands there has been a comparative failure in the diffusion of learning. Wherever Catholicism of either type has met the competition of a considerable Protestantism, it has done some excellent educational work. Yet in the lands where it has had the dominant sway, the figures of illiteracy are are often appalling. There is no land on earth, having Protestantism as the major faith of the people, where the vast proportion of the population does not read and write. It might be deemed ungracious to give the specific statistics from the latest sources; and the facts would doubtless be somewhat questioned. Let me, therefore, ask the members of this audience to begin the study for themselves. Make two tables, one showing the heavily Catholic

lands; one showing the heavily Protestant lands. Put Spain, Mexico, Italy, the South American Republics, and even France in one list; put Sweden, Norway, Denmark, England and the United States in the other. Or if you wish to make the test where somewhat similar climatic and social conditions prevail, compare the Austria that was with the Germany that was; compare Holland and Belgium; compare Switzerland and Italy. Personally, I am not willing to declare that the dark figures stand for a deliberate program based on the idea that illiteracy is the mother of devotion. That harsh charge I would be slow to admit. But I do affirm that the tables prove that Protestantism has somewhere gotten that peculiar intellectual idealism that has made for popular education. It is no full defense against this general statement to say that Catholicism has held the lands where conditions made the teaching of the people difficult. Why did it get and keep those lands? And why is it that in the second generation of Protestant converts, thousands of them being in Mexico and the Philippines, illiteracy practically disappears? The Protestant faith which has stood for a democratic access to God through Christ

has likewise stood for a democratic access to education.

In the final place, I am a Protestant because study again convinces me that the Protestant system of emphasis and worship produces on the average the best characters. Again I would avoid the fallacy of the universal. Both systems have produced wonderful men. There are canonized Catholic saints and uncanonized Protestant saints. Above our poor spiritual averages, St. Francis and John Wesley both rise like mountains. When once an English Cardinal declared that Protestantism did not produce saints, he was speaking either mistakenly or technically. Those of us who have lived in the Protestant fold have found genuine saints in every place and congregation, men and women against whom the most efficient devil's advocate would have difficulty in making a successful plea. They walk unheralded the ways of quiet service and often show, like Moses, the glory of the shining face when they themselves are beautifully unconscious of it all.

Negatively we may make a claim, as well. The statistics of wrong-doing do not put Protestantism to the blush. Nor do the records show that any undue proportions of the lawless

were tutored in our Protestant Sunday Schools and Churches. There is always a danger that a heavy stress upon a sacramental or sacerdotal system may mean a lighter stress upon reverent and righteous behavior. The Church may be in some real sense a refuge for sick souls; but when too many such appear upon the lists of suspicion we have the right to question the religious regime that had the molding of their impressionable days. If, in the long run, the test of a system be the man it produces, Protestantism may claim, at the least, that the methods of her freedom have not failed in the making of character. Her roll of great saints is long and glorious; and her roll of saints, hidden from fame but well known to God, will join their illustrious comrades as evidences that she has not failed in the main business of a church of God.

Tonight I make no wide appeal to the cloud of witnesses. I am presuming that all the three forms of faith presented here could bring an army of good confessors. But I may, in closing, add my testimony to my observation and say in humility of heart that in the Protestant fold I have found freedom, faith, peace, hope, redemption; and that because of the reasons that I have given and of the inner

belief that anchors my spirit, I confidently expect at the last to pass my soul up to God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, amid the cheering assurances of my fellow-confessors, but without the mediation of an ecclesiastical monarchy.

WHY I AM AN AGNOSTIC

Clarence Darrow

An Agnostic is a doubter. The word is generally applied to those who doubt the verity of accepted religious creeds or faiths. Everyone is an Agnostic as to the beliefs or creeds they do not accept. Catholics are Agnostic to the Protestant creeds, and the Protestants are Agnostic to the Catholic creed. Anyone who thinks is an Agnostic about something, otherwise he must believe that he is possessed of all knowledge. And the proper place for such a person is in the mad-house or the home for feeble-minded. In a popular way, in the western world, an Agnostic is one who doubts or disbelieves the main tenets of the Christian faith.

I would say that belief in at least three tenets is necessary to the faith of a Christian: a belief in God, a belief in immortality, and a belief in a super-natural book. Various Christion sects require much more, but it is difficult to imagine that one could be a Christian, under any intelligent meaning of the word, with less. Yet there are some people who claim to be Christians who do not accept the literal interpretation of all the Bible, and who give

more credence to some portions of the book than to others.

I am an Agnostic as to the question of God. I think that it is impossible for the human mind to believe in an object or thing unless it can form a mental picture of such object or thing. Since man ceased to worship openly an anthropomorphic God and talked vaguely and not intelligently about some Force in the Universe, higher than man, that is responsible for the existence of man and the universe, he cannot be said to believe in God. One cannot believe in a force excepting as a force that pervades matter and is not an individual entity. To believe in a thing, an image of the thing must be stamped on the mind. If one is asked if he believes in such an animal as a camel, there immediately arises in his mind an image of the camel. This image has come from experience or knowledge of the animal gathered in some way or other. No such image comes, or can come, with the idea of a God who is described as a force.

Man has always speculated upon the origin of the universe, including himself. I feel, with Herbert Spencer, that whether the universe had an origin—and if it had—what the origin is will never be known by man. The Christian

says that the universe could not make itself; that there must have been some higher power to call it into being. Christians have been obsessed for many years by Paley's argument that if a person passing through a desert should find a watch and examine its spring, its hands, its case and its crystal, he would at once be satisfied that some intelligent being capable of design had made the watch. No doubt this is true. No *civilized* man would question that someone made the watch. The reason he would not doubt it is because he is familiar with watches and other appliances made by man. The savage was once unfamiliar with a watch and would have had no idea upon the subject. There are plenty of crystals and rocks of natural formation that are as intricate as a watch, but even to intelligent man they carry no implication that some intelligent power must have made them. They carry no such implication because no one has any knowledge or experience of someone having made these natural objects which everywhere abound. To say that God made the universe gives us no explanation of the beginning of things. If we are told that God made the universe, the question immediately arises: Who made God? Did he always exist, or was there some power

back of that? Did he create matter out of nothing, or is his existence co-extensive with matter? The problem is still there. What is the origin of it all? If, on the other hand, one says that the universe was not made by God, that it always existed, he has the same difficulty to confront. To say that the universe was here last year, or millions of years ago, does not explain its origin. This is still a mystery. As to the question of the origin of things, man can only wonder and doubt and guess.

As to the existence of the soul, all people may either believe or disbelieve. Everyone knows the origin of the human being. They know that it came from a single cell in the body of the mother, and that the cell was one out of ten-thousand in the mother's body. Before gestation the cell must have been fertilized by a spermatozoon from the body of the father. This was one out of perhaps a billion spermatozoa that was the capacity of the father. When the cell is fertilized a chemical process begins. The cell divides and multiplies and increases into millions of cells, and finally a child is born. Cells die and are born during the life of the individual until they finally drop apart, and this is death.

If there is a soul, what is it, and where did it come from, and where does it go? Can anyone who is guided by his reason possibly imagine a soul independent of a body, or the place of its residence, or the character of it, or anything concerning it? If man is justified in any belief or disbelief on any subject, he is warranted in the disbelief in a soul. Not one scrap of evidence exists to prove any such impossible thing.

Many Christians base the belief of a soul and God upon the Bible. Strictly speaking, there is no such book. To make the Bible sixty-six books are bound into one volume. These books were written by many people at different times, and no one knows the time or the identity of any author. Some of the books were written by several authors at various times. These books contain all sorts of contradictory concepts of life and morals and the origin of things. Between the first and the last nearly a thousand years intervened; a longer time than has passed since the discovery of America by Columbus

When I was a boy the theologians used to assert that the proof of the Divine inspiration of the Bible rested on miracles and prophecies. But a miracle means a violation of a natural

law, and there can be no proof imagined that could be sufficient to show the violation of a natural law; even though proof seemed to show violation, it would only show that we were not acquainted with *all* natural laws. One believes in the truthfulness of a man because of his long experience with the man, and because the man has always told a consistent story. But no man has told so consistent a story as nature.

If one should say that the sun did not rise, to use the ordinary expression, on the day before, his hearer would not believe it, even though he had slept all day and knew that his informant was a man of the strictest veracity. He would not believe it because the story is inconsistent with the conduct of the sun in all the ages past.

Primitive and even civilized people have grown so accustomed to believing in miracles that they often attribute the simplest manifestation of nature to agencies of which they know nothing. They do this when the belief is utterly inconsistent with knowledge and logic. They believe in old miracles and new ones. Preachers pray for rain, knowing full well that no such prayer was ever answered. When a politician is sick, they pray for God

to cure him, and the politician almost invariably dies. The modern clergyman who prays for rain and for the health of the politician is no more intelligent in this matter than the primitive man who saw a separate miracle in the rising and setting of the sun, in the birth of an individual, in the growth of a plant, in the stroke of lightning, in the flood, in every manifestation of nature and life.

As to prophecies, intelligent writers gave them up long ago. In all prophecies facts are made to suit the prophecy, or the prophecy was made after the facts, or the events have no relation to the prophecy. Weird and strange and unreasonable interpretations are used to explain simple statements, that a prophecy may be claimed.

Can any rational person believe that the Bible is anything but a human document? We now know pretty well where the various books came from, and about when they were written. We know that they were written by human beings who had no knowledge of science, little knowledge of life, and were influenced by the barbarous morality of primitive times, and were grossly ignorant of most things that men know today. For instance, Genesis says that God made the earth, and he made the sun to

light the day and the moon to light the night, and in one clause disposes of the stars by saying that "he made the stars also." This was plainly written by someone who had no conception of the stars. Man, by the aid of his telescope, has looked out into the heavens and found stars whose diameter is as great as the distance between the earth and the sun. We now know that the universe is filled with stars and suns and planets and systems. Every new telescope looking further into the heavens only discovers more and more worlds and suns and systems in the endless reaches of space. The men who wrote Genesis believed, of course, that this tiny speck of mud that we call the Earth was the center of the universe, the only world in space, and made for man who was the only being worth considering. These men believed that the stars were only a little way above the earth, and were set in the firmament for man to look at, and for nothing else. Everyone today knows that this conception is not true.

The origin of the human race is not as blind a subject as it once was. Let alone God creating Adam out of hand, from the dust of the earth, does anyone believe that Eve was made from Adam's rib:—that the snake walked and spoke in the Garden of Eden—that he tempted

Eve to persuade Adam to eat an apple; and that it is was on that account that the whole human race was doomed to hell:—that for four thousand years there was no chance for any human to be saved, though none of them had anything whatever to do with the temptation; and that finally men were saved only through God's son dying for them, and that unless human beings believed this silly, impossible and wicked story they were doomed to hell? Can anyone with intelligence really believe that a child born today should be doomed because the snake tempted Eve and Eve tempted Adam? To believe that is not God-worship; it is devil-worship.

Can anyone call this scheme of creation and damnation moral? It defies every principle of morality, as man conceives morality. Can anyone believe today that the whole world was destroyed by flood, save only Noah and his family and a male and female of each species of animal that entered the Ark? There are almost a million species of insects alone. How did Noah match these up and make sure of getting male and female to reproduce life in the world after the flood had spent its force? And why should all the lower animals have been destroyed? Were they included in the sinning

of man? This is a story which could not beguile a fairly bright child of five years of age today.

Do intelligent people believe that the various languages spoken by man on earth came from the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel, some four thousand years ago? Human languages were dispersed all over the face of the earth long before that time. Evidences of civilizations are in existence now that were old long before the date that romancers fix for the building of the Tower, and even before the date claimed for the flood.

Do Christians believe that Joshua made the sun stand still, so that the day could be lengthened, that a battle might be finished? What kind of person wrote that story, and what did he know about astronomy? It is perfectly plain that the author thought that the earth was the center of the universe and stood still in the heavens, and that the sun either went around it or was pulled across its path each day, and that the stopping of the sun would lengthen the day. We know now that had the sun stopped when Joshua commanded it, and had stood still until now, it would not have lengthened the day. We know that the day is determined by the rotation of the earth upon its axis, and not

by the movement of the sun. Everyone knows that this story simply is not true, and not many even pretend to believe the childish fable.

What of the tale of Balaam's ass speaking to him, probably in Hebrew? Is it true, or is it a fable? Many asses have spoken, and doubtless some in Hebrew, but they have not been that breed of asses. Is salvation to depend on a belief in a monstrosity like this?

Above all the rest, would any human being today believe that a child was born without a father? Yet this story was not at all unreasonable in the ancient world; at least three or four miraculous births are recorded in the Bible, including John the Baptist, and Samson. Immaculate conceptions were common in the Roman world at the time and at the place where Christianity really had its nativity. Women were taken to the temples to be innoculated of God so that their sons might be heroes, which meant, generally, wholesale butchers. Julius Caesar was a miraculous conception,—indeed they were common all over the world. How many miraculous-birth stories is a Christian now expected to believe?

In the days of the formation of the Christian religion, disease meant the possession of human beings by devils. Christ cured a sick man by

casting out the devils, who ran into the swine, and the swine ran into the sea. Is there any question but what that was simply the attitude and belief of a primitive people? Does anyone believe that sickness means the possession of the body by devils, and that the devils must be cast out of the human being that he may be cured? Does anyone believe that a dead person can come to life? The miracles recorded in the Bible are not the only instances of dead men coming to life. All over the world one finds testimony of such miracles; miracles which no person is expected to believe, unless it is his kind of a miracle. Still at Lourdes today, and all over the present world, from New York to Los Angeles and up and down the lands, people believe in miraculous occurrences, and even in the return of the dead. Superstition is everywhere prevalent in the world. It has been so from the beginning, and most likely will be so unto the end.

The reasons for Agnosticism and skepticism are abundant and compelling. Fantastic and foolish and impossible consequences are freely claimed for the belief in religion. All the civilization of any period is put down as a result of religion. All the cruelty and error and ignorance of the period has no relation to re-

ligion. The truth is that the origin of what we call civilization is not due to religion, but to skepticism. So long as men accepted miracles without question, so long as they believed in original sin and the road to salvation,—so long as they believed in a hell where man would be kept for eternity on account of Eve, there was no reason whatever for civilization; life was short, and eternity was long, and the business of life was preparation for eternity. When every event was a miracle, when there was no order or system or law, there was no occasion for studying any subject, or being interested in anything excepting a religion which took care of the soul. As man doubted the primitive conceptions about religion, and no longer accepted the literal, miraculous teachings of ancient books, he set himself to understand nature. We no longer cure disease by casting out devils. Since that time, men have studied the human body, have built hospitals and treated illness in a scientific way. Science is responsible for the building of railroads and bridges, of steamships, of telegraph lines, of cities, towns, large buildings and small, plumbing and sanitation, of the food supply, and the countless thousands of useful things that we now deem necessary to life. Without skepti-

cism and doubt, none of these things could have been given to the world.

The fear of God is not the beginning of wisdom. The fear of God is the death of wisdom. Skepticism and doubt lead to study and investigation, and investigation is the beginning of wisdom.

The modern world is the child of doubt and inquiry, as the ancient world was the child of fear and faith.

WHY I AM A CATHOLIC

Judge John P. McGoorty,
Superior Court of Chicago

We are assembled here tonight in a spirit of fraternity. Dean Swift once said: "Some people have religion enough to hate one another, but not religion enough to love one another." It is seldom that a controversial spirit will aid one in seeking the truth.

A foundation for an inquiry as to which is the true religion must begin with the existence of God. By God we mean the First Cause of all things. That there is a God all-powerful, all-just, and all-merciful, the creator of heaven and earth, who guides and rules the destinies of the world, is the almost universal belief of mankind. That God sent His Son upon earth to sanctify and save men by the merit of His precious blood shed upon the cross, is the basis of Christianity. His coming, His life, His death, and His resurrection, were vividly foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament, centuries before his birth. These prophecies were as marvelous in accuracy and detail as if they were written after, rather than before, the events which they foretold.

Pascal said: "The accomplishment of all the prophecies is an enduring miracle, and no other proof is needed to convince us of the truth of the Christian religion."

Christ himself referred to the Old Testament as a proof of His divinity. His life, His works, His teachings and His prophecies verified it. He made the blind to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the dead to come to life again. He foretold His death and resurrection. With His coming, for the first time came the revelation of the Holy Trinity. He, the second person of the Blessed Trinity, came to found a Kingdom on earth. He came to found a spiritual Kingdom to extend over all the world, to include all peoples, and all climes. For the first time in the history of mankind there was established a religion international in scope and character. He called this Kingdom His Church. When He said to His apostles—"As my Father has sent me, so I send you," He thereby conferred upon them the power to do all things which He Himself might do in the furtherance of His divine mission.

He intended His Church to be universal—"Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." They were all required to

teach the same doctrine. "Teaching them all things whatsoever I have commanded of you" —and then He made certain to them the indefectibility of the deposit of faith which He intrusted to them when He said: "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." But Christ did more when He uttered these words "I am with you all days"—which have a definite meaning, as shown in the Old Testament as well as in the New. He guaranteed that through Him, and under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, He would guard His Church against error. He established but One Kingdom, but One Body, but One Household; therefore, He provided for unity of faith and of doctrine. Christ established only one church.

Christ intended that the deposit of faith—namely, His teachings and precepts intrusted by Him to His apostles—should ever remain unchanged and incorruptible. He knew that without unity His church could not be perpetual, and He had promised the Twelve that He would be with them at all times, until the consummation of the world. He knew that His Church could not be universal and possess unity of faith without authority to bind together its essential elements, so Christ estab-

lished a religion of authority. His teachings and precepts formed the constitution of His Church. He gave to His apostles the power given to Him by His Father, when He said: "As my Father sends me, so I send you." The Apostles could only teach those doctrines and truths revealed to them by Christ.

Here, then, we see the complete lines on which Christ planned the beginning of His Church. It was to be taught and governed by the Apostles, with authority equal to His. They were all to teach the same complete body of doctrine He had given to them. They were to preserve perfect unity of belief and action, under the guidance of St. Peter, whom Christ made the visible head of His Church.

To the apostles alone He gave the power to make men holy, by means of sacred rites, the mass and sacraments, in which the merits of the Redeemed were brought into direct contact with the visible souls of the Church. To the apostles He said: "Baptize—whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them. Do this in commemoration of me." Again He said: "Who heareth you, heareth me; who despiseth you, despiseth me." It was a Church absolutely dependent upon the apostles for its three

essentials—doctrine, government, and means of grace.

As Christ's Church was to continue to the end of the world, the power and authority which He gave to His apostles was to be transmitted by them to their successors.

The Church which Christ founded was an apostolic Church. While Christ's Church was a spiritual Kingdom, it was to be a visible society on earth. As a corporate society, it had to have a head vested with supreme authority. Christ, the founder of His Church, was the visible head while on earth, as He is the invisible head of His Church through all eternity. When Christ asked: "Who do they say I am?" It was Peter who answered—"Thou art Christ, the Son of the ever-living God." And when the Master said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of John, for neither flesh nor blood hath revealed this to you, but only My Father in Heaven." "Thou art Peter (meaning rock), and upon this rock I shall build My Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."

Thus Christ promised Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, to appoint him the visible head of His Church, and that promise was fulfilled

after the resurrection, when Christ thrice asked Peter: "Dost thou love me?" and Peter answered: "Lord, thou knowest that I love Thee." He thereupon intrusted to Peter his fold and his flock, saying to him, "Feed my lambs—feed my sheep." And, again, He said to Peter, to make more clear the authority and jurisdiction which Christ conferred upon him: "unto thee I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." Among the Jews these words were the highest symbol of authority. He then further said to Peter: "Whatsoever thou shall bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven; whatsoever thou shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven." Peter, therefore, by the divine authority of Christ, became the visible head of His Church on earth, with supreme authority and power to guide and direct that Church—which is truly the mystical body of Christ, and the continuance of Jesus on earth.

The primacy of Peter was recognized by Christ and by His apostles. He always addressed Peter first. In the four gospels, Peter's name is mentioned first. It was Peter who first preached to the Jews. It was Peter who performed the first miracle, when he said to the lame man outside the Temple: "Gold and silver I have none, but I will give thee that

which I have—arise, and walk." It was to Peter that God gave the keys of His Church.

As Christ instituted His Church, it could not be permitted to err—it was necessary that the visible head of that Church, in interpreting, defining and guarding the deposit of faith given to her, should be free from error. Therefore, the words of Christ—"The Spirit of Truth will be always with you."

If the Church ever became fallible in Her teachings or Her doctrine, she would then cease to be the Church of Christ. Infallibility does not mean inspiration. It does not mean inspired of God. It does not mean revelation, or the revealing of some truth hitherto unknown. It only means that, guided by the spirit of the Holy Ghost, the visible head of the Church, in defining or interpreting matters of faith or morals, would be free from the possibility of error. Neither is it necessary for the visible head of the Church on earth to be impeccable. Therefore, it is not necessary that infallibility should be possessed by a saint, or a man of great holiness. It may be said, in truth, however, that of the two hundred sixty-five (265) successors of St. Peter, most of these have been men of holiness and sanctity. But Christ recognized the frailties of human nature—one of

his apostles denied him, another betrayed him; among others of his apostles there were dissensions. But Christ had ordained that His Church could not err.

The infallibility of the head of Christ's Church on earth is limited to doctrines of faith or morals. If the successor of St. Peter should make a pronouncement upon temporal affairs or matters political, it would not be binding in conscience upon the members of the Church. It is evident that there must be a supreme authority, to interpret and define the deposit of faith left by Christ with his apostles. The alternative to a supreme authority is the interpretation of Christ's teachings and doctrines by private judgment.

It cannot be denied that the scriptures, in many parts, are obscure and difficult of interpretation. The exercise of the right of private judgment, private interpretation, without authoritative guidance, has resulted in confusion and disunion, and numberless religious societies or churches.

Enshrined in the Bible are the teachings of Christ and His apostles, because the Bible is the word of God. But the Bible does not contain all of the teachings of Christ—St. John said: "What Christ said to his apostles during

the forty days after the resurrection could not be contained in one hundred books."

It is the Catholic Church that determined the authenticity of the Bible and clothed it with divine authority. It is the Catholic Church that solemnly decreed the Bible to be the word of God. The Catholic Church does not, however, depend upon the Bible alone, but upon the Bible and tradition of the teachings of Christ which have come down to us through his apostles and the early Fathers of the Church.

Christ did not write a book, and, so far as we know, did not command a book to be written. He constituted His Church a living, teaching body—"To teach all things whatsoever I have commanded unto you."

Christ's Church, through all of the ages, has safeguarded the Bible and the doctrine of faith contained therein; she has encouraged its reading by her followers, under the supreme guidance and direction of the Church. Without such supreme authority, there could be no organic unity, Christ's Church must be one in faith, one in sacraments and sacrifice, one in government, and one with her own past.

Among all the churches of the world, which church answers these essentials? Which church

possesses unity, common worship, common sacrifice and sacraments, and a common jurisdiction and authority extending over all the world? Which church, in unbroken succession for nearly two thousand years, has preserved its historical identity, from the time of Peter?

There is only one church in the world that claims to be infallible. A church may claim to be infallible, and be false; but a church that does not claim infallibility, cannot be the church founded by Christ.

In the long line of Peter's successors there has been no change of doctrine; there has been no instance in which any doctrine of faith has been modified or retracted. This, of itself, is a living miracle, and proves conclusively that the Church which Christ founded has been under his constant guidance and direction.

When the Church defined the infallibility of the Pope, when speaking as its pastor and supreme head on questions of faith or morals. it defined no new doctrine, as the infallibility of the Pope had always been accepted. Again, when the Church defined the doctrine that the Mother of God was immaculate, it only affirmed the implicit belief that the Mother of the Son of God could not be otherwise.

Christ's Church must be somewhere on earth

today. It can only be that church which possesses the classic and essential features—that is to say, that it is One, Holy, Catholic or Universal and Apostolic. That Church is the Catholic Church.

WHY I AM A JEW

Rabbi Jacob Tarshish—Temple Israel, Columbus, Ohio

Being a local speaker of considerable eloquence, and a man extremely popular through his participation in various phases of civic life in Columbus, Rabbi Tarshish was given a tremendous ovation. Earlier in the evening it had been determined by lot that he should be the last speaker of the symposium, and with that important position in his favor, he fittingly climaxed an unusual evening of thought and oratory.

In comparison with the three preceding speakers, Rabbi Tarshish, a man of 36 years, appeared extremely youthful. While he directed much of his talk to Mr. Darrow's opinions, he also summarized the purpose of the gathering. Even though the audience had been listening to speeches for one hour and a half, before he started, Rabbi Tarshish held their closest attention.

"As I see it, this is an experiment in intellectual brotherhood," he said, in analyzing the purpose of the symposium. "I am a Jew," he said, "because I believe the teachings of the Jewish

religion and because I am proud of the contributions of the Jewish people." He stressed the conception of God in the Old Testament, as opposed to Mr. Darrow's views. He disagreed with the theory that man is insignificant, declaring that man is made in the image of God.

"The Jewish people have given the world the monotheistic idea of God, and the Old Testament, including the Ten Commandments," he declared, adding that the Jew has given Jesus to the Catholic and to the Protestant; "Jesus, a great, gentle, wondrous spirit, as inspired as any of the Jewish prophets, whom we regard as distinctly a Jew, who came to preach a Jewish message to the people and who taught a message full of love and understanding and sympathy with the whole world."

Rabbi Tarshish asked that the Christian say farewell to the age of discrimination against his people. and called attention to the necessity of working together at common tasks, such as the removal of poverty, sin, vice and hatred.

"I have been sitting here trying to determine the chief purpose of this symposium," began Rabbi Tarshish. "There are two purposes, I think, and I would like to give you both interpretations.

"First, that you may hear the opinions of four

men of divergent beliefs, and thus determine your own individual faith.

"Second, to give us a knowledge of the other man's religion and belief, so that we may be more sympathetic, and that hatred and prejudice may vanish from our midst. It can hardly be said that the purpose of the symposium is to discover the true religion. On the other hand, as I see it, the forum is an experiment in intellectual brotherhood."

Applause indicated that his statements had struck a responsive chord with the audience.

"I have been given the task of telling why I am a Jew," continued Rabbi Tarshish, who added that he is a Jew for two reasons; 1—"Because I believe in the teachings of the Jewish religion. 2—Because I am proud of the Jewish people."

"The Jew has always maintained a righteous position in the economic world, and after 4000 years he has a right to regard his history without a serious blemish, or even a shadow."

"Yet the intensest passions of man, over the greatest period of time, have been leveled against the Jew."

Referring to the evening's second speaker, Rabbi Tarshish remarked: "Mr. Darrow says the true answer to all things is agnosticism. He

says he does not know. My contention is that man started by doubting, saying he did not know, but ended by saying 'I know.' Originally, religion had a crude conception, but it must be recalled that science also had a primitive beginning. But religion is not crude when there are such glorious conceptions in it as are shown in the Old Testament.

"Let me say to Mr. Darrow," he continued, "that the present religious conception of God is not that which is narrowly described in the Bible. It would take a hundred books to cover the teachings of Jesus."

Rabbi Tarshish described the Jewish religion as being entirely different from other religions such as the Persian, the Grecian and the Germanic. He related that the Jewish religion is based on monotheism. Science, he explained, is also based on monotheism, in this—the unity of the principle governing matter.

"The fundamental unitary principle which we call God is a concept which the Jews gave to the world and it is one from which no one has ever departed—not even the scientists.

"If we are to accept the thought that man is insignificant—a helpless nonentity, without a free will, then there can be no progress. Against this contention, Judaism says: 'Man

is made in the image of God', and so is able to make a choice between good and evil. The Jew says it must be the *good* which is chosen.

"By being 'made in the image of God'," he added, "we mean that man has the powers of progress within him, and that God is the ideal toward which man is going. It is this concept which gives us the Bible stories to which Mr. Darrow objects. The Bible is a message of truth and a message of hope. There is nothing about these Bible stories which an honest man cannot honestly receive."

Rabbi Tarshish defended the Old Testament as unsurpassed in poetry, literature and inspiration. He described it as superior to the writings of Shakespeare, Goethe and Dante. He referred to it as "the spiritual masterpiece of the ages."

"The Jew," he said, "gave the world the Old Testament, which is one of the greatest collections of literature, because it is spiritual. If we want spiritual comfort, we go to the book of Psalms." He referred to the book of Job as one of the most dramatic stories ever written, even exceeding the works of the immortal Shakespeare. He stated that social righteousness can be found in no better place than in the books of the prophets. These prophets he

reported as having laid the foundation of wisdom.

Continuing, Rabbi Tarshish gave the Old Testament as the basis of the New Ttestament and stated that the Ten Commandments were given to the Christians by the Jews, and that the Christians in turn gave the Commandments to the world at large.

"And the Jews gave the world Jesus," added the rabbi dramatically, although in a voice of subdued eloquence. He remarked that Jesus came to teach the Jew, and that his teachings were so beautiful that the whole world took them up. Christianity, in fact, received its great impulses from the Jew.

Rabbi Tarshish related that the Jew also gave to the world the religion of Mohammed. Jewish thought has influenced the thought of the world for two thousand years. And the Jews are but a drop in the ocean. They started out as a nomadic tribe. God gave them the religion which, although the Jew was in the minority, has influenced the thought of the greatest nations. Israel went on when all the other great nations crumbled. Jerusalem fell and the Jew was scattered and made the scorned of all nations. He was despoiled, robbed, dishonored. By all laws of economics,

he should have fallen, but he did not because he had his synagogue and because he had a mission to perform for the world.

Referring to the many illustrious Jews in the fields of science, music, philosophy, art, drama, law, finance, etc., Rabbi Tarshish impressively called the roll of such leaders as Einstein, Steinmetz, Mendelssohn, Spinoza, Disraeli, Belasco, Heine, Untermeyer, and Strauss. "These," he said, "are merely a small proportion of those Jews who have influenced the career of mankind."

Having recounted the history of the Jewish people, embracing a period that witnessed their development from a small nomadic tribe in the wilderness to a prosperous race numbering more than 14,000,000 people, Rabbi Tarshish pleaded that the religion and the history of the Jews be respected. "We should say farewell to that age when the Jew was the object of discrimination, and the Jew should say to the Christian and the Christian should say to the Jew, 'Let us be brothers.'

"We might even include the agnostic," added the representative of Judaism, as he turned to Mr. Darrow. A roar of laughter and appreciation greeted this sally, and Mr. Darrow joined in the response.

By joining hands, Rabbi Tarshish pointed out that mankind can build a greater era, an era when men shall forget war and realize that they have a common mission in destroying poverty and sin, in removing vice and hatred from the face of the earth, and in etsablishing international peace and good will.

Judaism, as summarized by Rabbi Tarshish, holds that God is one, undefinable, perfect, spiritual, eternal; the omnipresent creator of all that is—the omniscient ruler of the universe, the wise and loving Father of all mankind. Judaism says that man is gifted with reason through which he acquires a knowledge of the world and its makings; that he has a conscience through which he distinguishes between good and evil; that he is endowed with a free will, enabling him to choose between right and wrong.

The Jewish faith further proclaims that man has a body and a soul; the body decaying after death, but the soul, made in the image of God, living immortally. In his relationship to his fellowman, the individual should guide himself by the ideal of divine perfection. He is put on this earth, not only for the purpose of satisfying his own needs and desires, but also to serve mankind.

In answer to the problem of pain, struggle, and sorrow, Judaism says they are for the purpose of strengthening the soul, a spiritual education through which we not only grow larger, but we also gain a deeper sympathy for our fellowman. The people of Israel regard themselves as gifted with a genius for religion. They were the first to recognize one God and his law of righteousness. No matter how they have had to suffer through the ages, they always felt consciously or subconsciously that it was their duty in the world to spread the light of religion and morality. The hope of every true Jew is that some day there will be ushered in a messianic time when mankind will be united in love and peace, when evil will disappear and pain will vanish. The Ten Commandments form the rock upon which Israel's religion and morality stood. These fundamental principles of Judaism were set forth by Rabbi Tarshish as forming the background of Jewish thinking throughout the ages.

THE AFTERMATH

Indicating the intense interest in the religious forum herein reported, the Ohio State Journal (Columbus, Ohio) of March 14, 1929, carried a lead editorial under the heading, "The Other Man's Religion." The significant comment follows:

"The great outpouring of people who listened to the discussion at Memorial Hall Tuesday evening bore witness to the widespread and intense interest in religion. People had to pay to get in, but the big hall was packed to the doors, and hundreds were turned sorrowfully away. And not all who were interested were there or tried to be there. Probably no other recent event in Columbus, and we have just been through a presidential campaign, challenged so much attention and caused so much comment.

"None of the four distinguished speakers proved anything, of course. Each merely stated what he believes to be the reasons for his faith, and faith is not susceptible of proof. It is the evidence of things unseen and these things seem different to different minds. It is a significant fact that each of the speakers is, in

his views on religion, what one would expect him to be from the background of his life. Rabbi Tarshish was born a Jew. Bishop Hughes is the son of a Methodist minister. Judge McGoorty was the child of a Catholic home. Clarence Darrow's father was an Agnostic and made no 'bones' of expressing his opinions.

"We do not mean to suggest that none of these men has done his own thinking; all have done that, but still each has followed the bent in his sectarianism, or his lack of it, that was made natural to him by his antecedents and his early environment. A few overcome the natural bent, but most of us, in our sectarian convictions or preferences, are nominally, at least, what our parents were. Thus to condemn or despise or look askance upon another person because of his views on religion is mere snobbery, a hateful quality founded on ignorance and unreasoning conceit. It is like thinking you are better than other people because they are not in your family.

"One of our local pastors said that he did not approve of such discussions as that staged Tuesday evening, fearing that they served merely to accentuate and increase sectarian bitterness and hatred. We should think they would have just the opposite effect. We should

think that when four fine men get up and state as best they can the reasons for their convictions on religion, even if it is shrewdly suspected that the real reasons are birth and early environment, or perhaps because of that shrewd suspicion, the reaction of the intelligent listener to each would be: 'Well, he may be as nearly right as I am, if not more so. At any rate, he certainly has as good a right to his opinion as I have to mine, and I'm not going to quarrel with him because we don't think alike on questions that nobody can answer for sure'."

TYPOGRAPHICAL
UNION LABEL